

cultural and rural change in developed countries, generally documents the fact that the American model *can* be exported to countries with similar structures and production goals. Mechanized agriculture may be modified to meet the needs of the smaller-sized farms of Western Europe and Japan. Large collective farms in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe can be made more viable, like those in the United States and Canada, by attracting appropriate light industry (food-processing plants are an obvious example) to the countryside. But the book concludes with a warning that modernized agriculture, even in developed countries, can lead to disruption of rural life.

De Janvry's book deals specifically with this question of balance between agricultural development and social conditions throughout Latin America. Using a thoroughgoing Marxist analysis, the author reviews the history of agriculture in the region and finds previous development strategies inadequate. These include the promotion of "intermediate" technologies to create employment, rural development based on the Green Revolution, and the demands of Third World nations for redistribution of the world's wealth through the New International Economic Order. In contrast to these, de Janvry's solution appears to be an alliance between urban workers and the peasantry to create "mass-based" democratic regimes.

The question the book poses, of course, is a simple one: Does one see Latin America better by looking at it through Marxist spectacles? For most non-Marxists, the answer will probably be No. But the book is certainly a scholarly contribution to the literature of Latin American development.

De la Peña's book is a study of agricultural and rural change in a single area—the state of Morelos south of Mexico City, known to history as the home of the peasant revolutionary leader Emiliano Zapata. Essentially a sociological study, the book shows how agriculture is enmeshed in local social, cultural, and religious life. The conclusion is that Mexico must "find its own modernity," integrating economic progress into a total way of life.

—Walter E. Ashley

*WORLDVIEW* welcomes letters to the editors. For readers who wish theirs to be considered for the Correspondence column, a length of not more than 300 words is suggested. *WORLDVIEW* reserves the right to edit correspondence chosen for publication.

## Correspondence

### NICARAGUA & THE PRESS

To the Editors: Richard Worthington's maundering article in the December *Worldview* ("Nicaragua and the Press") clearly escaped the editor's pen. It is suffused with social science gibberish. None of the information promised is furnished.

Instead of giving us a factual report about Sandinista efforts to choke *La Prensa*, he sets out to justify Sandinista repression by resorting to neutral-sounding terms such as "agreed-upon boundaries," "judicious" as distinct from "capricious repression" and "negotiated solutions." The appropriate term is censorship. He mentions but does not explain the import of the Sandinista effort to build their own mass media. Thankfully, he does not ask us to believe that we are about to witness an old-fashioned rough-and-tumble Hedley Johnson newspaper circulation battle.

As one wades through the thicket of Mr. Worthington's social science lingo, however, one realizes that his main argument is that *La Prensa* should be restrained because it practices poor journalism. He asserts that it is sensationalist and propagandistic, as if these flaws justified government censorship. Enforcement of that standard would have closed William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* and jailed Lincoln Steffens. Even the *Washington Post's* hallowed Watergate coverage was flawed by sensationalism, while the venerable point-spread-publishing *New York Post* wallows in this vice.

Mr. Worthington sentimentally or ideologically favors the Sandinista revolutionaries, which leads him to conclude wrongly that a free press should follow an agenda set by government authorities. Under freedom of the press even pseudo-journalists like Mr. Worthington have the right to err.

F. Randall Smith

*New York, N.Y.*

Richard Worthington Replies:

The specifics of my differences with Mr. Smith are not the most important part of this dialogue, but I should note that I used the term "censorship" three times in describing Sandinista actions; that I never expressed a belief that *La Prensa* should be restrained (I hold no such belief); and that my article was loaded with facts, both critical and supportive of the Sandinistas, while Mr. Smith's invective makes no factual observations about Nicaragua at all.

The purpose of my article, as stated in

the third paragraph, is to use the press controversy as a means of better understanding the dynamic institutional framework within which the Nicaraguan revolution is taking place. The portrayal is of a very fragile and unstable framework, but one which nonetheless has possibilities for development in liberal directions, even though the current drift is toward confrontation and repression. There is an important political point to be made of all this, which is only implicit in my article: The decisive factor shaping the course of Nicaraguan political development may well turn out to be U.S.-sponsored destabilization, which has played a significant role in the clashes along the Honduran border that already have cost five hundred Nicaraguan lives. The domestic consequences of this in Nicaragua include militarization, economic disruptions, and the state of emergency under which civil liberties have been restricted. This suggests that the best thing we *Norteamericanos* can do, whether our personal agendas emphasize freedom of the press or social change, is persuade our government to let the Nicaraguan revolution take its own course.

### MONOTHEISM

To the Editors: F. E. Peters's book, *Children of Abraham*, sounds interesting from reviewer Robert J. White's description ("Books," November). But one thing puzzles me. Is it Peters's or White's idea that the doctrine of the Trinity contains an implicit rejection of monotheism? Again, which of these—the author or the reviewer—believes that the Eucharistic sacrifice is supposed to transform flesh into the Word? So far as I know, nobody at all holds the second idea, and certainly few, if any, defenders of the doctrine of the Trinity would agree that it implicitly rejects what it explicitly defends: that there is only one God, not two or three or any other number of gods.

Theodore W. Volckhausen

*New York, N.Y.*

Robert J. White Replies:

The idea that the doctrine of the Trinity contains an implicit rejection of monotheism is not White's, Peters's, or, as Mr. Volckhausen asserts, that of "any defender of the doctrine." Rather, the "mystery" of the Trinity—God existing in Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit and being One in "substance"—has led, historically, not only to controversy and debate among Christians (e.g., the Arians, Sabel-